

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 179, 1279

bill. It's very simple. It's just changing the language from Senator Wickersham's amendment back to what we passed and was signed by the Governor in LB 179. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bourne. For debate on the Bourne amendment, Senator Bohlke, followed by Senator Bourne, Hilgert, Chambers, and Wickersham. Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I hope that...I know there's a lot of discussion going on with the press and people asking about a number of things, but this is a significant issue that I think we need to discuss and I hope everyone has a clear understanding. I did introduce a bill for two years that would do what Senator Bourne's amendment does to the bill. The real tragedy of this is that once in a while you have people out there who actually read what we do, and then they think that they can act on it. Let me tell you how Sally Peck read it. The bill as advanced said, individuals who have a permanent physical disability or who have lost all mobility, such as to preclude locomotion without the regular use of a mechanical aid or prosthesis. The "or" made Sally believe people like her 60-year-old husband would finally qualify. However, the Revenue Committee...the Department of Revenue determined that that was a drafting error, and in their rules and regs did not adopt it. Is that correct, Senator Wickersham? I wanted to make sure I was correct. So, here you have a bill that went out of committee; the Department of Revenue reads it, they determine that's not really what the bill says; and so the rules and regs are adopted...are not adopted with how the bill reads. We have people out there who read bills such as this, and to this family it would mean \$770 for one year on their property taxes. It's a tragedy. Now, I'm not so sure, Senator Bourne, when it came out of committee that the committee thought...I think Senator Wickersham is correct in that the Revenue Committee thought that it was more limiting, because the A bill, I believe, with the "or" in it, could be a potential of \$14 million. There may be some interpretation of that, because this actually does not include mental disabilities, the one introduced...that I introduced this year would have included that, but it would have had a significant A bill. The situation